REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicant originally submitted Claims 1-19 in the application. In previous amendments, the Applicant amended Claims 1, 2, 6 and 14 and added Claim 20. In the present response, the Applicant has not amended, added or canceled any claims. Accordingly, Claims 1-20 are currently pending in the application.

I.   **Formal Matters and Objections**

The Examiner has objected to the title of the invention for not being descriptive. In response, the Applicant has amended the specification to change the title as indicated above. As such, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the objection to the title.

II.   **Rejection of Claims 1, 3-6 and 8-13 under 35 U.S.C. §102**

Previously, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 3-6 and 8-13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,635,088 to Hind, *et al.* The Applicant respectfully disagrees. As agreed to by the Examiner during the telephonic interview, Hind fails to disclose analyzing at least one tag of a received message expressed in a non-negotiated language to determine **if** the receiving device can process the message as recited in independent Claim 1. Additionally, Hind does not teach receiving messages in a non-negotiated language without employing a fixed protocol as recited in independent Claim 6. Instead, Hind discloses a data processing network **that employs protocols** for connections. (*See* column 6, lines 42-58 and Figure 2.) Accordingly, Hind does not teach each element of independent Claim 6.

4

Since Hind does not teach each and every element of independent Claims 1 and 6, Hind does not anticipate Claims 1 and 6 and Claims dependent thereon. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the §102 rejection with respect to Claims 1, 3-6 and 8-13 and allow issuance thereof.

III.   Rejection of Claims 2 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner rejected Claims 2 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hind in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,763,499 to Friedman, *et al.* The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

As discussed above, Hind does not teach each element of independent Claims 1 and 6. Hind also does not suggest each element of amended independent Claims 1 and 6. Hind relates to reducing the size of documents employing compression techniques. (*See* column 1, lines 8-12.) The Applicant finds no suggestion in Hind, however, of analyzing at least one tag of a received message expressed in a non-negotiated language to determine if the receiving device can process the message. Thus, the Applicant does not see where Hind teaches or suggests each element of independent Claims 1 and 6. Friedman has not been cited to cure the deficiencies of Hind but to teach the subject matter of the above dependent Claims. The cited combination of Hind and Friedman, therefore, does not provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness of independent Claims 1 and 6 and Claims dependent thereon. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the §103(a) rejection of Claims 2 and 7 and allow issuance thereof.

IV.   **Rejection of Claims 14-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103**

The Examiner has rejected Claims 14-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hind in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,738803 to Dodrill, *et al.* The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Since Hind does not teach or suggest analyzing at least one tag of a received message expressed in a non-negotiated language to determine if the receiving device can process the message, Hind also does not teach or suggest each element of independent Claim 14 which includes: a tag recognizer configured to determine to what extent a message can be processed by a receiving device by analyzing tags in the message wherein the analyzing occurs at the receiving device. The Applicant does not find where Dodrill cures these noted deficiencies of Hind. On the contrary, Dodrill teaches a proxy browser that employs a device capabilities table to identify the capabilities of user devices and only send information to a user device that the user device can process. (*See* column 11, line 49 to column 12, line 6, and Figure 3.) Thus, a user device in Dodrill is not concerned with determining to what extent a message can be processed since the user device receives information that it can process.

The cited combination of Hind and Dodrill, therefore, does not teach or suggest each and every element of independent Claim 14. Accordingly, the cited combination of Hind and Dodrill does not provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness of independent Claim 14 and Claims dependent thereon. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the §103(a) rejection of Claims 14-20 and allow issuance thereof.

V.   Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant now sees all of the Claims currently pending in this application to be in condition for allowance and therefore earnestly solicits a Notice of Allowance for Claims 1-20.

The Applicant requests the Examiner to telephone the undersigned attorney of record at (972) 480-8800 if such would further or expedite the prosecution of the present application. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, credits or overpayments to Deposit Account 08-2395.

Respectfully submitted,

HITT GAINES, PC

J. Joel Justiss
Registration No. 48,981

Dated: May 8, 2007

P.O. Box 832570
Richardson, Texas 75083
(972) 480-8800

7